

REMARKS

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Official Action dated June 2, 2003 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled and new claims 67-70 have been added. Claims 24-66 have been withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 3-23 and 67-70 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Applicant hereby affirms the election of the invention embodied by Group I, claims 1-23.

The Official Action rejected claims 1-8, 10-21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,036,583 to *Aizawa et al.* (hereinafter "*Aizawa*"). With respect to claims 1 and 2, this rejection is moot. With respect to claims 3-8, 10-21 and 23, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicant respectfully submits that *Aizawa* does not teach every element recited in each of claims 3-8, 10-21 and 23. To further illustrate, claim 67 recites a system for polishing surfaces of objects comprising in part "a first transfer robot; and a second transfer robot, the first transfer robot configured to transfer one of said objects to the polishing unit, the second transfer robot being configured to transfer another of said objects to the polishing unit." Further, claim 70 recites a system for polishing surfaces of semi-conductor wafers comprising in part "a first transfer robot; and a second transfer robot, the first transfer robot and the second transfer robot both being configured to transfer semi-conductor wafers to the polishing unit, where the second transfer robot is configured to transfer semi-conductor wafers from the polishing unit to a post-polishing unit wherein the first transfer robot and the second transfer robot cooperatively transfer the semi-

conductor wafers to and from the polishing unit to efficiently process the semi-conductor wafers through the polishing unit.”

Aizawa does not disclose a polishing system as recited in either of independent claims 67 or 70. The Official Action indicates that *Aizawa* teaches polishing units 10a, 10b and transferring robots 20a, 20b which are attached to a carriage. Further, according to the Official Action, an upper hand of the transferring robot 20a holds semi-conductor wafers which are to be polished as well as semi-conductor wafers which have been dried, while a lower hand of the transferring robot 20a transports semi-conductor wafers that have been polished. See Official Action at p. 5.

In fact, *Aizawa* discloses two robots which transfer wafers to and from a delivery gate 18 wherein the first robot 20a, with its two arms 38a and 38b, operates by transferring wafers between a storage cassette 12a and the delivery gate 18, and wherein the second robot 20b, with its two arms 38c and 38d, operates by transferring wafers between the delivery gate 18 and the polishing/cleaning units. Unlike the present invention, as set forth in claims 67 and 70, *Aizawa* does not disclose, teach or suggest two transfer robots for transferring objects to a polishing unit. Furthermore, *Aizawa* does not disclose where one of the two robots is also used to transfer objects to the post-polishing unit, as recited in claim 70. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that *Aizawa* fails to disclose each and every element recited in claims 67 and 70 as required under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Accordingly, the Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 3-8, 10-21 and 23, which now depend from claim 67.

In addition, the Official Action rejected claims 9 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Aizawa* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,948,203 to *Wang* (hereinafter “*Wang*”). The rejection of claims 9 and 22 is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” The Applicant respectfully submits that neither *Aizawa* nor *Wang*, either singularly or in combination, disclose each and every element recited in claims 9 and 22. As discussed above, *Aizawa* fails to disclose each and every element of claim 67, from which claims 9 and 22 depend. Furthermore, *Wang* fails to address the previously noted shortcomings discussed with reference to *Aizawa*. As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 22 are patentable over *Aizawa* in view of *Wang* under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Notice of the same is earnestly solicited.

The Applicant hereby authorizes the Commissioner of Patents to charge any fees necessary to complete this filing, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, or credit any overpayment in fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for the necessary extension of time.

Dated: May 10, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Mark R. Kresloff
Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No.: 42,766
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant